App. F. IX-4

Previous references.

1930 Geol)

File No. 65-30

Serial Nos. 1-10

Later references.

Preserve 25/11/32/C3

(55)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Par B for Oct 32.

SUBJECT.

on of Mrs Khan Begum Sahiba
& of acquisition of her inam lands
in Villages, Mysore Taluk for
mining purposes.

From Shahanshah Khani Begum Yahia, w
of Shr. Hyder Ali Khan, Bangalore. Appeal
petition d. 28.12.30 presented on her beha
by Shr. Iqbal Hussain, Advocate.

States that the question of the renewa
of her prospecting license in respect of Ther
and Magnesite is under correspondence wi
Govt, that in the meantime acquisition pr
ceedings have been ordered by Govt under
Section 8 of the L.A. Regulation for making purposes
fied her objection etc before the L.A. Offi
through her counsel and prays that pendin
disposal of her application Govt may be
pleased to withdraw from the acquisitio
of the lands advertised for acquisition
under Section 48 of the Regulation and th
urgent orders may be issued to the L.A. Of
ficer to postpone the taking possession,
and further prays that the prospectin
license may be issued to her on considera
ation of the heavy investments made by he
on the land.
The petition bears a Court fee Stamp of th
value of Rs. 2. The 2nd Member's orders
28.12.30 on the petition are

66 The L.A. Officer may be instructed to defer taking possession of the land pending disposal of this application."

Available papers are put up for perusal

Vide with a draft as per 2nd Member's orders.

21.12.30. Please address D.C. Mysore and send copy to L.A. Officer.

Revised draft dated 11.

10.12.30.

30/12/30

To The Dy Commr, Mysore Dt, Mysore. No. D. 1735 d. 30.12.30. States that an objection petition has been presented by him through his counsel appealing against the proposed acquisition of his lands by grant for mining purposes and requests that immediate instructions might be issued to the Y.D.O. Mysore to defer taking possession of the lands in question pending disposal of the appl

Govt sanctioned the acquisition of the 16 acres and 25 guntas of land in Yannamanya Doddi Katuru village, Mysore Taluk, in Y.O. No. D 11880-3/Gen.44-28-8 d. 22.4.30, the cost of acquisition being met from the amount of Rs. 200 deposited by the Company (Oakley Bowdens Co.) The petitioner has appealed against this

The previous history of the case is given in pages 16 to 15 of Govt. File 68-19 and 2 to 20 of Govt. 68-19 pls. 16 to 30, from which it is seen that two mining leases had been originally granted over lands in Dodkatteri Inam village one for Magnesite & Chrome ore in favour of Messrs. Tata Iron & Steel Company of Bombay over a block of 28 acres 28 guntas and the other in respect of Chrome in favour of Messrs. Oakley Bowden & Co., of Madras over a block of 220 acres 29 guntas. The former lease is in force for a period of 30 years from 29th August 1917. The latter is reported to have been under issue for a period of 30 years from that date of execution. There seems to have been some dispute between the lessees and the Inamdars over the question of the ownership of mineral rights and it was stated that it was open to Govt in accordance with the provisions of Rule 57 of the Mining Rules (Section 38 of the I.M. Code) to acquire the lands for handing them over to the lessees on payment of adequate compensation to the owners of surface rights. The Director of Geology was informed that if the Company was keen on continuing the lease a notice might be issued to the parties fixing a time limit within which they should come to an understanding with the Inamdars failing which the I.A. Regulation might be set in motion. The Director reported that the Inamdars were all proving obstructive to the lessees and making unreasonable demands and that they did not accept the offer of the Company to pay an annual surface rent

on all lands taken over by them for mining purposes during the period of actual mining operations, and that Messrs. Oakley Bowden Ltd who held a mining lease (No. 155) in Dodkatur village stated that no mining operation could be carried on by them owing to the obstruction caused by the Inamdars and requested that the lands comprised in their mining block might be acquired and stated that they were prepared to pay the upset price for the land and the assessment thereon and any reasonable compensation that might be proposed. In connection with the application of Dodkatur Inamdars for the grant of mining licenses in their lands they were informed that no licenses would be granted to them as no satisfactory work was likely to be done by them owing to the prosperitary disputes among the several shareholders.

Mrs. Khair Begum represented in Jany 1929 that she had since purchased all the shares of other Inamdars and applied for a license for Chrome and magnesite. The application for Chrome was rejected on the ground that it had since been assumed by the Government throughout the State but a license for magnesite alone was granted on 9.5.29. She again applied for permission to prospect for Chrome and the Director of Geology recommended that it might be allowed as a special case to be prospected for by her subject to the condition that she should come to a workable

The Director of Geology was directed to request the D.C. Bijapur to hold an enquiry into the matter after giving notice to the lessee Company & the Inamdars as well as to the occupants of the lands and submit a report on (1) the objections, if any, of the Inamdars to the grant of surface rights to the lessees over the lands (2) the terms on which the Inamdars and occupants were prepared to grant the surface rights to the lessees if the objections should be found to be unreasonable (3) the reply of the lessees to the terms proposed by the former (4) the D.C.'s opinion in the matter. After protracted correspondence the Director forwarded for publication in the Gazette a declaration both in English & Kannada in respect of the properties required for mining purposes by the lessees Tatas Iron & Steel Co. who had agreed to bear the cost of acquisition of the lands in question. In Geol. File 74-25 it is stated that Messrs Alley Bawden & Co., Badami who had also been meeting with obstructions from the Inamdars who are the surface owners of the lands in carrying on their prospecting work applied to the Director of Geology for getting the surface rights of the lands in Dodkatur village for mining purposes, that Mrs. Khani Begum (the present appellant) was written to to inform

if the liberal terms offered by the Company were acceptable to her and if not to quote her own terms but that no reply was received from her in spite of a reminder therefore that it was therefore necessary to put the G.A. Regulation into operation in this case also as in that of Tata Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. owing to the obstructive attitude of the Inamdars. In yr. 1919-25 the Director reported that Mrs. Khani Begum who was granted a prospecting license for Chromite & Mica in their letters Nos. D.346.24/30/yrd. 28-3-11 d. 7.10.24 & D.4.3242/yrd. 18-24-2 d. 13.11.24 over a block of two square miles of land in the Ahpone Taluk did not carry on any work on the land and that as no application was made for the renewal of the license the same was cancelled. However in their letter No. D.2239/yrd. 27-26-10 d. 2.9.27 they were pleased to convey sanction, as a special case in the circumstances represented, to the grant of a fresh P. license for Chromite and Magnesite in favour of Mrs. Khani Begum over a block of 870 acres of land for a period of one year and that she was informed that no renewal beyond the above period would be granted to her. On 8th May 1929 the Director in his letter No. D.1154/yrd. 96-28-29 was requested to inform Mrs. Khani Begum who had applied for a further renewal that her request could not be granted as her work was not satisfactory, as she had already had more than three renewals also in view of the policy of yrd. viz: reservation of Chromite

General and Revenue Secretariat | Govt | File No.

Serial No.

Again on 21st May 1929 She appealed to Govt against their order sanctioning the acquisition of certain lands in Doddkatya & Lingadevellimillages required by Messrs. Tata Iron & Steel Co., and She was informed on 27-6-29 that her appeal was too late and was not maintainable as an award had already been made. She requested a reconsideration of this order declining to admit her appeal and She was thereupon informed that her appeal was not maintainable and that She must seek her remedies if any in the Dt Court. Her subsequent appeal d. 11.7.29 to the same effect was also rejecting her applin for a mining lease or for the renewal of her prospecting license for Chrome & Magnesite was also rejected stating that Govt saw no reason to reconsider her case.

Hon. Khani Begum Zahida now prays that the order re: taking possession of her lands by L. A. officer (L. D. O.) Mysore, may be deferred and that Govt may be pleased to withdraw from the acquisition of her lands and that the prospecting license may be renewed to her in consideration of the large investments made by her on the land.

A stay order was issued to the D. G. on the 31st ultimo as ordered by the 2nd Member on the petition.

Called for orders as to whether a report may be called for from the Director of Geology on the

general allegations contained in the appeal petition before hearing the Advocate for the petitioner.

MRD.
7.1.31.

Please see under against the various items of the petition.

The two requests of the petitioner

(1) to withdraw from the acquisition of certain lands in the Indian village of Doddabetta ordered vide G.O. No. 22. 4. 30 (Flag A.) in connection with the mining lease granted to Messrs. Oakley Bowden & Co.

(2) to grant her a prospecting license for minerals in the village.

As regards (1), the acquisition was ordered by Govt. after mature consideration & after giving the petitioner ample opportunity to come to terms with the Lessee Company. But as she would not come to terms & was unnecessarily obstructing the terms, the acqn. was ordered (vide file No. 704-25 (1-3) (Flag E). There is, therefore no reason to withdraw from the acqn. If she has any objections against the acqn. proceedings, she has to appeal to the H. Ct. under S. 18 of L.A.A. A similar appeal of hers in respect of the land acquired for the Lake Iron & Steel Co. was also rejected (vide files Nos. 115-28-1-3 & 7-1 & 2) (Flags L & M).

With regard to (2), this has also been finally

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 63 of 1930

Serial No.

required as the Grantees were given various opportunities during 1914 to do some real work & show that their application was bona fide & they failed to do so. It was rejected that they had no intention at all of working the minerals but that their object in obtaining a lease was to establish their rights to obtain as much as they could as owners of the under-ground minerals. (vide flag N+K) This request may also be rejected. Their claim to ownership of minerals has been rejected so long ago as 1914 under Cl. 3 of S. 38 L.R. as it was not performed within the period fixed (vide file No. 23-14-7) (Flag B)

Gen. Sec.) Ca 9/1.

Mr. Iqbal Narain, vakil for the Petr. who was here the other day in connection with this petition, wanted to be heard personally before the matter was finally disposed of. If necessary a date may be fixed who may be informed

Gen. Sec.) [illegible]

Yubd with a draft to The Advocate for pet.

MR. KG

12.1.31.

Seen CA 13/1

13 To Mir Iqbal Hussain Esq., B.A., B.L., Advocate, Richmond Road, Bangalore. No. 730 d. 14.1.31. Informs him that the his petition has been posted for hearing on Tuesday the 20th instant at 2.30 p.m. and requests him to be present at the time in the Chamber of the 3rd Member of Council.

From Mr. Iqbal Hussain, 12, Richmond Rd Bangalore. Letter d. 17.1.31. States that the above date is inconvenient to him & requests that the case may be ordered to be posted to the 29th, 30th or 31st instant according to the convenience of the Member Yubd for orders.

MR. 17.1.31. By Mr. Iqbal Hussain who was here just now, explains that as Mr. Hyder Ali Khan, who had come to Bangalore especially for this case, was suddenly recalled to Kolar, he was forced to ask for a fresh date. If agreeable, one of the dates mentioned by him may be kindly fixed.

3rd Mbr.

CA 17/1

Friday - 30th January - 2:30 P.M. has been fixed by the Minister. The party may kindly be intimated.

Hearing 30th January.

Kindly allot the

date to 29th January.

1 P.M

19.1.

Subject for orders
on 7th March may
be fixed. The case
has not yet been
heard.

21/2.

III

OFFICE OF THE ~~FIRST~~ MEMBER
OF COUNCIL,

Bangalore, 9-6-1 ..... 193 (

The case of Mr. Ismail Hussain — (Geological dept. license hearing) posted for 29th inst. is adjourned to Friday the 6th Feby. — 2 P.M. The party may kindly be informed

Sd

for Sec. Dev. Bd.)

App. F. 1

General and Revenue Secretariat

Gen'l File No. 65 of 1930

Serial No.

As the petition of Mr. Iqbal Hussain has been adjourned from the 29th of this month to Friday the 6th Feby 1931 at 2 P.M., a draft intimating the party of the same is submitted herewith for orders.

MV.
27.1.31.

Leave & re-submit
Ca
27/1

To Mr. Mir Iqbal Hussain, Advocate, Bangalore
No. 7928 d. 27.1.31. Informs him that the case has been posted for hearing to 6th Feb 1931 (Friday) at 2 P.M.
Draft issued and file resubmitted with reference as noted.

MV.KS
28.1.31.

As the P.A. to the 3rd Member has intimated to-day a further change of the date of hearing of the above case, a draft informing the party accdy is submitted herewith for orders.

MV.KS
30.1.31.

Leave
Ca
30/1

To Mr. Mir Iqbal Hussain, Kenneway, Kennoway Road, Cantonment, Bangalore. No. 8257 d. 30.1.31. States that a further change has been since made in the case posted to 7th Feby 1931 at 2 P.M.
Draft issued and file resubmitted as per orders above.

MV.KS
1.2.31.

General and Revenue Secretariat | Geol. | File No. 65 of 193 0.

Serial No.



Please let me have information on the following points:

1) Is not the area, notified for acquisition, included in the area in respect of which Messrs Oakley Bowden & Coy. have been given a mining lease?

(1) The land notified for acquisition is wholly included in the area covered by Messrs Oakley Bowden's lease

2) Was the area in respect of which the petitioner was given a prospecting license different from that over which Messrs Oakley Bowden & Coy. hold a mining lease or was it included in the area of the said mining leases?

(2) Yes, different

3) When was the mining lease to the Company given and how long have they been deprived of their right to work their lease because of the attitude of the petitioner?

3) Mining lease - 25.8.1918 (Prospecting lease 25.8.1917) Obstruction from the start.

4) Are petitions in regard to matters connected with the acquisition of lands under the Land Acquisition Regulation to be dealt with in the Revenue Department or in the Department for which the lands are required?

Dept for wh lands are acquired.

NMC 20/2/31 Bn. CE W/P

As information on the above points is not available in this office a draft calling for the same from the Director of Geology is submitted herewith.
NMC 24.2.31. After issue of the draft, the Resident will be consulted re question 4

To the Director of Geology in Mysore. No. D. 8565 t. 25.2.31 forwards the above petition for a grant on the annual allegations therein together with information on certain other points mentioned in the letter.

Draft issued and file received for being sent to the Revenue Branch for answering Dr. Mention's query No. 4 on the previous page.

(Rev. Br.) Ca 28/2

26.2.31.

Kind reference is invited to Rule 10 of the Rules under the Land Acqn. Regulation Petn regarding acquisition of lands have to be dealt with in the department for which the lands are required as that department is responsible for acqn. etc. of such lands

US 4/3 According to Rule 10 of Rules under L.A.R. the D.C. shall submit for the sanction of Govt a declaration statement to the Dept of the Govt Secretariat which budgets for and carries out or sanctions the work. Since acquisition cases for acquisition of lands required for depts other than Rev. depts are dealt with in the Rev. Dept it seems to follow that petitions relate

General and Revenue Secretariat

Genl. File No. 64

Serial No.

Depts. Concerned

AP

5/3-

Rev 6/3

Dear Secy)

Mr. Iqbal Hussain (Petitioner's lawyer) was heard. The petitioner represented that he would try to make an attempt to come to an agreement with the Company as regards the payment to be made for the surface rights over the lands in question. The case may be posted on 23rd April 31

Mule
23.3.31

The P.A. to the 1st Member said that the Advocate has been informed in person and that it is not necessary to write to him again. The application will be kept in Genl till the 23rd of next month.

MR.
26.3.31.

Mr Amir Iqbal Hussain asked for some more time he has been allowed another fortnight

Mule

Genl B till the 3rd April 1931 on which date the file has to be issued to 1st Member.

MR
27.3.31.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

1274

WD 02563—GPB—50,000—8 7 30

Govt. File No. - 6 74 of 1930. | General and Revenue Secretariat

From the Director of Geology. No. 4070-22 d. 9.3.31. Submits the report called for in the 2nd above.

Reference —— 1st Member's orders on page 12. The Director has furnished replies to queries 1 to 3 therein and as regards the last query (4) the Revenue Branch states that petitions relating to acquisition cases have to be dealt with in the Depttts concerned. (Vide Pages 13 & 14).

Submitted for orders.

PUD

Replies to members' queries are noted in the margin of queries & reference — p. 12

MR. 13.3.31. Attention is respectfully invited to the report received from the Director. In the circumstances reported it is for orders if the party should be given a hearing or informed that she may seek redress in a Civil Court if she is not satisfied with the award of the L.A. Officer. Submitted for orders.

PUD

Ray 13.3.

KP: 13/3/31 Even tho' acquisition proceedings have been completed, the Govt are competent under S.48(1) of the L.A. Regn. to withdraw from the acqn. so long as possession has not been taken.

The second request of the petr. for a prospecting licence is also for orders.

The petr. requests an opportunity to be heard before final orders are passed (Vide letter dt)

12/3

CE 13/3

The appeal seems untenable. The appellant's lawyer may however

5" 1.49

App. F. III,—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | Legs | File No. 64 of 1930-31

be heard - as this seems to have been accepted by already

1st Chamber)

16 3 31

Ce 16/3

Yes, he may be heard on Monday 23rd inst — 12 noon

Mag

16.3.31

16 3 31

Ce 17/3

Draft D.O. informing the Advocate of the above is herewith submitted.

MR. KP

17.3.31.

Issue Ce 17/3

Issued, M.D. 8966 d. 17.3.31.

It was personally ascertained from the P.A
that the Advocate for the petitioner (Mian
Iqbal Hussain) ~~that~~ had asked for more
time to enable his petitioner to intervieu
the Agents of the Company & come to Terms with them.
So it is not known how the matter now
stands the file may be sent to the P.A. to
the 1st Member for kindly intimating the
stage at which the case now stands.

General and Revenue Secretariat

fcol File No. 65 of 193

Serial No.

Submitted with reference to Members minute dt 2/8/31
No further representation from the Executive has been received till now. It is for orders whether the file may be closed and recorded as no further action in the matter seems to be necessary at this late time

19/8/32

Put up on the 5th of September please. 22/8/32

Recorded as directed above

9/32

Submitted with respect to Hon'ble Member's order dt 2.8.31 awaiting for instructions as to the further action to be taken in the case as nothing has been heard from the Lawyer though over a year has elapsed.

8/9/32

Ex. Secy) The matter may be treated as closed

16.9

I. Rev.) An Endorsement may be given to petitioner in reply to her last representation that there are no reasons to reconsider the orders already passed

19.9.32

If any order for stay has been obtained Acquisition proceedings may be cancelled.

19.9 19/9

GPB—50,000—8-7-30

An endorsement and a memo to the D.C., Mysore are submitted for approval.

1 K.P.
18/10/32

TYPING SECTION
18. OCT. 1932
GENL. & REV. SECTT.

Meherban Khan Begum Sahiba 10
No. 1687 S.Cy.-10-32

forwarding that Govt do not see any reason to reconsider the orders already passed.

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT
18 OCT.
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

To Dy Comm^r, Mysore Dt
No D 1688 S 19-10-32

21/10/

Forwards copy of the above

COURT FEE — MYSORE — TWO RUPEES

Presented by Zahal Hussain, Adv.

The L.A. Off Mysore wishes to be heard before the Court passes any order concerning this application by 28.12.70

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT 29 DEC 1970 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Geol 65-30-

Petitioners:-- Meharbhan Khani Begum Sahiba, wife of Mr. Hyder Ali Khan, the Rosary Rest House Road, Bangalore.

The petitioner above named most humbly and respectfully begs to submit:--

1. That Sarvamanya Doddakatur village in Mysore Taluk was granted as an unenfranchised Sarvamanya Inam to her father-in-law's Grand father Bakshi Raja Khan Saheb in 1772 by Tippu Sultan for meritorious service rendered by him at Karighatta during the attack of Lord Cornwallis. The same was confirmed by His Highness the late Krishnaraja Wodayar Bahadur in 1816 and an Inam Title Deed has also been since issued. The grant makes no reservation of any rights whatsoever, and as such the grantee was entitled to mineral rights also.

2. However when petitioner applied for prospecting license in respect of chrome and manganesite she was asked to obtain the rights of all the sharers which she did. While this was done licenses were given to her at inconvenient times and a renewal was refused. The matter is under correspondence with the Government.

3. In the meanwhile Messrs. Oakley Bowden & Co., obtained a license and entered into an agreement with petitioner's relative, Mr. Nasaruddin but having tried to misuse the same, a suit was filed by Mr. Nasuriddin and the same was finally decided even in

the Chief Court against the said Company. They tried to defy the proprietors of the village and entered into negotiations with the precarious tenants but pleaded their permanent tenancy. The Chief Court found against them.

Acquisition was started by Govt. on 22-4-30 (Flag Z) on the report of the Dy of Govt. there in spite of a Regd. letter to the Deputy enquiring whether she was agreeable to the Govt. after Dy there was no response from her (vide file 74-25(1-3) (Flag E)

4. The said Company also began negotiations with petitioner but before they could settle terms, it seems to have approached Government and obtained orders for acquisition proceedings being started in respect of 11 numbers comprising about 16 acres and 25 guntas.

Both preliminary notification & declaration as have been published (vide file Govt No. 44-28(1-9) D.C. reports that copies of the panchnama was duly served on the persons concerned but no objections were received.

5. The petitioner is a purdah woman and she has not had any notice whatever of the intended acquisition of these lands. She is not aware if preliminary investigation has at all taken place as required by section 5 of the Land Acquisition Regulation and the first intimation she had was upon notice served on her drawing her attention to Mysore Gazette Notification of 22nd April 1930 published in the Gazette of 8th May 1930 under section 8 (6?) of the Land Acquisition Regulation.

6. She filed her objection statement before the Land Acquisition Officer through her counsel and raised various objections therein.

Her appeal in these matters lies to the Chief Court under S. 18 C.A.R. and not to Govt.

7. That no enquiry was held, no date was fixed for the same. No evidence was taken, and to her surprise she got the Land Acquisition Officer's No.L.A.43-53/29-30 IV dated 27th November 1930, on 3-12-1930 at Bangalore and her counsel received the Memo of the Land Acquisition Officer dated 17th November 1930 which seems to be the earlier one, on 12th December 1930. The postal covers relating to them are enclosed and the dates of posting as indicated by the postal seals are interesting.

8. That the earlier of the two communications

was received later, and it will be observed that the objections raised by the petitioner are not at all considered by the learned Land Acquisition Officer. Further while the acquisition advertised was in respect of 11 numbers comprising 16 Acres and 35 guntas, the Memo of the Land Acquisition Officer intimating the fact of the award recites only 3 numbers comprising 3 Acres, 36 Guntas.

9. A copy of the objection statement filed by the petitioner before the Land Acquisition Officer is also enclosed for ready reference.

10. Petitioner invested about Rs.35,000 with a view to work the mines herself and to her misfortune she is not given the license to work a mine which is in her own lands, but an outsider has been allowed the privilege to the utter ruination of the humble petitioner who has made very heavy investments.

11. In any case, the work is not one of public utility, nor does any agreement appear to have been executed by the Company in favour of Government. At any rate no such agreement appears to have been published in the Gazette (Vide Sections 39 to 42, Land Acquisition Regulation).

12. Moreover equity and justice are also in favour of the petitioner.

Petitioner therefore respectfully prays that Government may be graciously pleased to withdraw from the acquisition of the lands advertised for acquisition in this case, under Section 48 of the Regulation and that pending disposal of this application, urgent orders may also be kindly issued to

the Land Acquisition Officer to postpone the taking of possession pending the disposal of this application.

The petitioner further prays that the prospecting license may be issued to her and enable her to reap the benefit of her ~~operations~~ exertions and heavy investments made at great trouble and inconvenience.

Khane Begum

ON MYSORE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

LA-43-5 B/29.30.

Mysore Government Service

LA. 43 5

Mr Rao Bahadur

Ranjindiah.

pleader

Hassan District

Hassan

To

The Superintendent of Police

Hassan District

Hassan

GURUBHAKTATILAKA
Rao Bahadur, N. S. Nanjundiah,
PLEADER, HASSAN.

Sabr / Pst / 19/2

Hassan
17-2-31.

Dear Mr. Nadir

I thank you for your kind
Do no. 4838- of yesterday's date asking
me if 28th inst. will suit me for Mr.
Hyderabad Khan's Landtegn Case.
Mr. Mir Iqbal Hussain BA BL Adv
Son of Mushir-ul-Mulk Mukh. Hamza Hussain
appears in the case. I have requested
him to meet you in person & fix upon a
date. 28th inst is very inconvenient
for me at Kanpur. I have suggested
7th or 9th March or 14th or 16th March.
I will be in Bangalore on 20th Inst.
myself & then we can settle a date

ಗುರುಭಕ್ತ ತಿಲಕ
ರಾವ್ ಬಹದೂರ್
ಎಸ್. ಎಸ್. ನಂಜುಂಡಯ್ಯ,
ಪ್ಲೀಡರ್, ಹಾಸನ.

Persuasion that will be possible to
movement

Yours sincerely
Shamrao

In the Court of the Revenue Sub Division Officer, and
Land Acquisition Officer, Mysore Sub Division,
Mysore.

Land Acquisition 43-53/29-30.

I, Khani Begum, (Mrs. Hyder Ali Khan,)Jahagirdar Sarvamanya Doddakatur Village, Mysore Taluk, residing at Hassan, beg to submit as follows:-

1. The Village of Doddakatur was granted as an unenfranchised Sarvamanya Inam in the year 1772 ~~but~~ Tippu Sultan in favour of Bakshi Rajakhan Saheb(the esteemed ancestor of my husband) for meritotious service rendered by him at Karighatta during the attack Lord Cornwallis. After the fall of Seringapatam, the said grant was restored and confirmed in favour of Bakshi Rajakhan Saheb on 6-11-1816 by a Royal Sannad under the Sign Manual of His Highness the late Krishna Raja Wadiyar Bahadur of revered memory. Subsequently when the Inam settlem troduced in Mysore, the terms of the original grant were confirmed in favour of the decendents of Raja Khana Saheb under a Title deed issued under the authority of the Government by the Inam Settlement Officer. The original grant gave full and absolute right of ownership to the late Raja Khan Saheb and his decendents in perpetuity over all kinds of property including rights over minerals comprised in the land granted to him. As stated above the said grant has been confirmed without any variations or restrictions up to date. I am in possession and enjoyment of the village in my own right absolutely as the grand daughter-in-law of the

original grantee the late Raja Khan Saheb and by virtue of my having purchased all the rights title and interest of all other heirs and legal representatives of the late Raja Khan Saheb.

2. Under the terms of the grant the village is an unenfranchised Inam and is inalienable and is, therefore in the nature of private property. It can not therefore be sold or alienated and cannot be acquired by the Government in contravention of the terms of the grant in perpetuity. The ~~enquire~~ entire acquisition proceedings are therefore misconceived and void ab initio and are liable to be set aside.

3. The village being an unenfranchised Inam no Survey settlement has been introduced therein, and tl lands do not bear any correct or recognised survey numbers. Only a valuation survey appears to have bee effected several years ago, but no detailed survey fixing the survey numbers, the extent, and the assessment of the lands, etc., has been effected up to this date. Hence the survey numbers , extent, assesment, and the names of the occupants, as mentioned in the notifications are not correct. I do not accept the legality , correctness , or the vlidity of the proceedings taken or passed regarding these lands. I submit that the propert is not liable to be acquired at all , and I do take objection to the legality and validity of the entii acquisition proceedings. I do not accept the correctness of the measurements or the accuracy of the description of the boundaries as published in the guazette. The entire village being the sole property of myself the entire compensation awardable , if the acquisition proceedings are held valid, is payable to me in full, and to no other.

on the ground that the purpose for which the acquisition is proposed i.e., for the purpose of enabling measures Oakley and Bowden Company to work the mines is not a public purpose within the meaning of the Land Acquisition Regulation. In the eye of law they are private individuals besides being foreigners and tney have no higher right than an humble subject of His Highness the Maharaja. I respectfully submit that it is an abuse of the provisions of Law to forcibly take away lands from private ownership under the guise of acquisition for public purposes only in orde to grant it to influential and powerful individuals like Messrs. Okely and Bowden Companies, while depriving the petitioner of the opportunity to work the mines he self though the mineral wealth is in her own lands.

5. Government has not been pleased to introduce survey settlement into the village inspite of my repeated app catibns in this behalf. The rates of the adjoining Government land pays several times the assesment paid by the ryot on the Inam lands in question. Therefore, the rate of compensation to be awarded should be based on the real letting value of the land in the open mark and not on the low assesment paid by the tenants.

6. I submit that the grant of the lease by the Government to the Company in question for mining chrome and magnesite on my land is thoroughly illegal. Under the terms of the Inam grant I am entitled not merely to the surface rights of soil but also to all kinds of properties including minerals on or in the land. The Minerals therefore belong to me absolutely and the action of the Government in granting the same to Messrs Oakley and Bowden Companies in direct violation of the terms of the grant is unsustainable and

has resulted in cons

The expedient of acquiring the land in order to give it to the said Comapny also contrvenes the definite rules made by the Government in this matter. Under Rule 80 of the book of Exploitations of minerals framed by the Government, it is the duty of every licensee or Lessee to first obtain the consent in writing of the occupier or owner of the land and settle with him the compensation payable for damage or injury in respect of the surface of such land. It is thus clear that the method of working the lease by the lessee is by negotiation or private Treaty with the owner of the land; and it is an extraordinary procedure unwarranted by any law and in direct conflict with the rules of the Government to compulsorily acquire the lands in order to unfairly and illegally secure an advantage for influential foreigners like Oakley and Bowden Companies to the prejudice of the owners of the land. The lands are still in my possession and occupation. But, the local agent of Messrs. Oakley and Bowden Comapny emboldened and encouraged by the department , and therefore by the support of the Government, had once tresspassed on my lands, excavated pits and removed ore although the land is still remaining in my occupation and even the Government had not yet obtained possession of it. The Company have thus infringed the rules of Government and violated law and otherwise committed grave acts of high handedness. Notices were sent to them, telegrams to the Government and the Geological Department on this account. Even written petitions were submitted to the authorities concerned. I initiated prosecution against them and also intend to file a suit against them for damages. At that time telegrams were sent to Government and the Geological Department, besides

submitting petitions to the authorities concerned.

7. I had myself obtained the prospecting license but renewal thereof was refused on account of the injustice done to me by the Geological Department. I preferred an appeal to Government against such refusal

8. The notice issued by this hon'ble Court in this case drew my attention to the Government Notification of 22-4-30 as published in the Mysore Gazette dated 8-5-30. I beg to submit that I had no notice whatever of the preliminary investigation in respect of the proposed acquisition under sections 4, 5 and 5 (a) of the Land Ac[illegible]egulation. Being a pardah woman a notice should have been sent to her for service. The Gazette publication was not at all noticed by me.

9. I do not admit that Oakley and Bowden Comapnies or those who moved for the acquisition is not a Comapny of the kind contemplated in the Regulation, nor is the purpose a public one as defined in the Regulation. The preliminary investigation under section 5 of the Regulation has not been properly conducted , and this has gravely prejudiced me and my interest in this respect. The omission to issue a notice to me beforehand seems to be fraudulent. The plan of the lands to be acquired is not prepared nor made available. The agreement that may have taken place between the oakley and Bowden Comp ny and our Government is not published as required by l

10. It was the duty of the Oakley and Bowden Company to have, in the first instance, complied with the requirements of Rules 80 and 81 of Rules and Orders regulating the grant of Mineral Licenses and Leases in Mysore published in the Departmental Bulletin No.8 relating to exploitation of minerals in Mysore. This is n a case of the lessee Company being unable to obtain

access to land within the area of the license or lease by mutual agreement, to justify an application to Government for instituting acquisition proceedings. On the other hand the Company began to enter into an agreement with one of the then proprietors of the Inam village - Mr. Nasaruddin Khan - but subsequently committed a breach of the same and then tried to dupe the proprietors. The result was that Mr. Nasaruddin Kh... sued the Company in the Mysore Sub Judge's Court for a permanent injunction and damages. ...pon the Company further wanted to avoid the proprietors, but went into some negotiations with the royts who are after all precarious tenants and had no proprietory rights. All the questions in dispute were thoroughly gone into in the said Civil suit and judgment was given against the said Company for a permanent injunction and for damages. (O.S. 3 of 1918-1919) It was also decided that the negotiations or arrangements made by the Company with the royts were of no avail as they never possessed any occupancy rights. The matter went up in appeal to the High Court and even there the decision went against this Company. Subsequently the Company tried to remove ore from the pits during nights This neccesitated the despatch of telegrams to Govern. ment and the institution of criminal proceedings against the said Company with the police. As the Company were not succesful in their unfair means they managed to secure the unfair and undue support of the new officers of the Geological Department whose attitude ~~toid~~ towards the humble petitioner also underwent a change in favour of the Company, and brought about the present acquisition proceedings by misleading the Government and wilfully concealing real facts from their knowledge.

On the other hand when the petitioner herself been anxious to work the mines and has actually

carried out preliminary work at considerable cost is most unfair that after investing about Rs 35,000/ for obtaining full proprietory rights in the village her license should not have been renewed but a lease granted to a foreign Company and even acquisition proceedings instituted to help an outside exploiter who gave up the fair course prescribed by the rules of the department about entering into fair terms wi the owner of the lands in question.

12. The petitioner claims compensation at a minim rate of Rs 1,000/ per acre and that by way of lease, the land being inalienable owing to its not being e franchised.

13. In view of the fact that the said Company has violated the conditions of the license, trespassed the land and deliberately defied the proprietors, a even committed nigh handed acts its license deserve being cancelled instead of the Company being shown special indulgence and encouragement at the cost of owner.

14. The Land Acquisition proceedings are invalid, illegal and improper in several respects. I pray th proceedings may be dropped or entire compensation a Rs 1,000/ per acre be awarded and paid to me in full after due compliance with law.

Sub Division Office
Mysore
27/11/1930.

LA 43-53
29-30

Endorsement

In continuation of this office memo ~~LA 43-53/29-30 dated 17-11~~ November 193

Mrs. Meharban Khani Begum Saheba, Jahgirdar of Nawab Dodkaher is informed as follows: with reference to her objection Statements filed by Rao Bahadur N. S. Ranjandiah, her counsel.

1. This court can not at this stage of proceedings enter into the merits of the legal ~~of the order of Government~~ Sanctioning the acquisition of the properties.

2. Valuation of the property has been fixed on a liberal interpretation and consideration of the value of similar lands in the neighbourhood. Reservation is made for any suo modification in this respect as an appellate ~~Court~~ may order.

3. With reference to the measurement of land as notified, She is informed that only to extent notified is acquired and the rest belongs to original ~~owner~~ holder. If the company exceeds this extent, it will be liable un

The amount of compensation ordered appears to be payable to the actual Khatedar or Anubhavadar as the case may be and the Inamdar appears to be entitled only to the commuted assessment for 25 years which has been fainted. If however She still thinks ~~that She is entitled to it, She must bring~~ a Stay order within the end of December 1930. failing which compensation awarded will be paid to present Anubhavadars and holders.

W Owen
Inam Officer
Mysore.

LA 467-53
8-30

Office of the Sub Division Officer

Mysore Sub Division.

Dated Mysore. 17th November 1930

Memo

With reference to her statement dated 26-9-30 in the matte of acquisition of certain lands in Inam Dodkatur village Mrs. Meharban Khani begum Sahiba is informed that awards have been passed and a sum of Rs 509-3-0 has been awarded toher for loss of land and assessment as per details noted in the margin. She is hereby require to hand over possession of the properties to the Amildar Mysore Taluk by the end of this month The amount of compensation can be had by applying to this office .

S.No	Extent	
77/1	1-10	107-13-0
47	1-2	90-9-0
62	1-14	116-7-0
		194-6-0
	Total Rs	509-3-0

15 years assessment on all the S.Nos acquired payable to the Inamdar for los of kandayam.

Sub Division Officer

Mysore Sub Dn.

TO

Mrs. Meharban Khani Begum Sahiba.

Jahgirdar of Inam Dodkatur.

C/O Hyder Ali khan Esq.

District Superintendent of Police .

HASSAN.



~~In the Court of~~

No.

~~Plaintiff~~—*Petitioner.*
Appellant

Shamim Begum

VAKALATNAMA

executed by the petitioner in favour of MR. MIR IQBAL HUSAIN, B.A., B.L., Advocate.

I hereby empower the said advocate, in person or by proxy, on $\frac{\text{my}}{\text{our}}$ behalf, to appear in, and conduct the above case, as well as any proceedings arising out of and connected with the same, either during its progress or after its decision, to execute any decree that may be passed therein in $\frac{\text{my}}{\text{our}}$ favour to withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the said suit and to do all such acts as may be proper and necessary for the due conduct thereof, including the signing, and presentation in Court, of the necessary petitions and papers.

And $\frac{\text{I}}{\text{We}}$ further authorize the said advocate to receive and give receipts for, any money, document, or other moveable property, that is, or may become, payable to $\frac{\text{me}}{\text{us}}$ in the course of the said case or proceedings.

Section Yes

File No. 65

Diary No. of letter received is 5191

Serial No. X 2

o. 6735

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193

Date of issue 30.12.30

Signed by tkrns Iyengar

Flag J

List of enclosures

of Inam lands in the above village for a public purpose

Copied by

The D.C. Kannur, etc

Sir,

In inviting your kind attention to memo No. L.A. 43-53/29 dt. 17.11.30 issued to Mrs. Mehaban Khani Begum Zahida, granddaughter of Inam Dod Katteem and wife of Mr. Hyder Ali village, Mysore Taluk, by the Deputy Division Officer, Mysore Taluk, requesting him to hand over possession, Mysore, I am directed to state that an objection petition has been presented on her behalf by Mr. Iqbal Hussain, Advocate, appealing aga-

proposed acquisition of the lands for
Mining purposes and to request that
immediate instructions might be issued
to the Yuke-Division officer, Mayo, not
taking
to dispose acquiring possession of
the lands in question pending the
disposal of application by Yent.

I have etc.,

Dist Secy to Yent.

Memo No.

Copy to the Yuke-Division
officer, Mayo. Yuke-Division, for
for information and favour of
action.

By Order

for Dist Secy to

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 5191

Section Genl.

File No. 65-30.

Serial No. 3

No. 7307.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193

Date of issue 14.1.31

Signed by .....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

To

Mir Iqbal Hussain Esq., B.A.
Richmond Road
Advocate, Bangalore City.

Sir,

~~Objection~~ With reference to the petition presented by you to the Legal Member of Council on behalf of Mrs. Khani Begam Sahiba, wife of Mir Hyder Ali Khan, in the matter of the acquisition of certain of her Inam lands in Doddatur village, Hoskote Taluk, by Govt for mining purposes by Messrs. Oakley Chemical Co., I am directed to inform you that the appeal petition has been posted for hearing ~~on~~ to Tuesday, the 20th

[over

~~to K. on (20th Jan 1931) at 1:30 P.M.~~

~~Jant of this month and you are~~ requested to be present as the time
~~requested to be present~~ in the Chamber of the Third Member of Council
~~on that date at the appointed time.~~

I have etc.,

Ca
13/1

Jun Dun Yeoh to Govt.

In the meantime, the D.C. Abysone has been requested to issue immediate instructions to the K. officer to defer taking possession of the lands pending disposal of your applⁿ.

Serial No.

Rect 17/1
4.45 P.M.
Secl 65-30-4

12 Richmond Road
Bangalore
17-1-31

To

C. E. Noronha Esqr
Secretary
Govt of Mysore
Bangalore

Sir,

I am thankful to you
for the intimation sent to
me that the Land Acquisition
case of Meharban Khan
Begum Saheba is posted

for hearing before the
Third Member of Commer-
Tuesday the 20th inst. As
that date is inconvenient
to me I will obliged if
you kindly have the
case reposted to the 29th, 30th o
31st according to the
convenience of the
Member. Thanking you.
in anticipation Yours obedient
Mir Ishaq Hussain

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section York.

File No. 65—30.

Serial No. 5

No. 7928.

Diary No. of letter replied to 5191

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193

Date of issue 27.1.31

Signed by ...17 C.S.M.

change has been made in case has been posted according to the 6th Feb. 1931

Yours sincerely
C.S.M.
27/1

List of enclosures.....

Copied by Ehfi
27/1.

Examined by.....

To

Mian Iqbal Hussain Esq., B.A. B.L.,
Advocate, Richmond Road, Bangalore.

~~Sir~~, Dear Mr. Iqbal Hussain,

With refer to your letter d. 17.1.31 and your personal interview with the 3rd Member on the same date, I am directed to inform you that, ~~the your petition~~ which had been posted for hearing on the 29th instant is adjourned to Friday, the 6th Feby 1931 at 2 p.m. and to request you to be present at the time in the Chambers of the Third

[over

WD 03559—GPB—25,000—25-6-30

United Missionary Council

I. Ham &c.,

Dear Lord to you.

Diary No. of letter replied to 5191

Section 4
File No. 63
Serial No. 6

D.O. No. 8057

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the 193

To

.....

Date of issue 30.1.31

Signed by MY Cam.

Dear Mian Iqbal Hussain,

In continuation of my D.O. letter No. D. 7928 d. 27.1.31 stating that your case has been posted for hearing ~~on~~ the 6th Feby 1931, I am desired to inform you that ~~the same is re~~ a further date has since been made by the case has been ~~posted for hearing on Saturday the~~ to the 7th Feby 1931 at 2 P.M. as the Member will not be in station on the 6th. ~~that date.~~

Yours sincerely,

CC
30/1

Asstt Secy, Dev Deptts.

List of enclosures

Copied by MY

Examined by

over

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 5191

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 25-2-31

Signed by Mrs. C. E. McKenna

List of enclosures 7 flag 2

Copied by.....

Examined by....

Section Genl.

File No. 55-30.

Serial No. 7

No. 8565

Encls 5

To

The Director of Geology in Mysore

Sir,

In forwarding herewith an appeal petition d. 28.12.30 presented through his Advocate by Mrs. Khani Begum Yasmin, wife of Mr. Hyder Ali Khan, Dy Supdt of Police, objecting to the acquisition proceedings pending in this Govt to be taken in G.O.No.D. 11880-83 | Genl-44-28-3 d. 22.4.30.

I am directed to request you to be so good as to submit a very early report on the annexed allegations contained therein for the information under

of Yaws. I am directed to request
that information on the following
points may also be kindly furnished
in this connection:-

(1) Whether the area notified for
acquisition is included in the area
in respect of which Messrs. Oakley Bou
den & Co. have been given a mining

(2) Whether the area in respect of wh.
petitioner was given a prospecting li
different from that area which Mess
Oakley Bowden & Co. hold a mining
or whether it was included in the area
said mining lease!

3) When the mining lease to the Compa
given and how long they have been a
of their right to work their mining lease
because of the attitude of the petitioner?, or

4) whether petitions in regard to matters con
nected with the acquisition of lands und
the L. A. Regulation to be dealt with in th
Revenue Dept or in the Dept for which the
are required? If the purpose of an immediate re-
ply is required. The petn's interviews were kindly fixed"

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 25-2-31

No. [illegible]

From

B. NARAINSAMIENGAR, Esq., B. A., B. L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Development Departments.

To

The Director of Geology in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

In forwarding herewith an appeal petition dated 28th December 1930 presented through her Advocate by Mrs. Khani Begum Sahiba, wife of Mr. Hyder Ali Khan, District Superintendent of Police, objecting to the acquisition proceedings sanctioned by Government in Government Order No.D. 11880-83/Geol. 44-28-9 dated 22nd April 1930, I am directed to request you to be so good as to submit a very early report on the several allegations contained therein for the information and orders of Government. I am also to request that information on the following points may be kindly furnished in this connection: -

(1) Whether the area notified for acquisition is included in the area in respect of which Messrs. Oakley Bowden & Co., have been given a mining lease?

(2) Whether the area in respect of which the petitioner was given a prospecting license different from that over which messrs Oakley Bowden & Co., hold a mining lease or whether it is included in the area of the said mining lease?

(3) When the mining lease to the Company was given and how long they have been deprived of their right to work their mining lease because of the attitude of the petitioner.

The favour of an immediate reply in the matter is requested.

p.t.o.

The petition and its enclosures may kindly be returned with your reply.

I have the honour to be,

- Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

25/2

Secretary to Government,

Development Departments.

ACH.2. 25/2.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Geol 65-30-8

GEN. SECRETARIAT. 65-45 10 MAR 1931 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH.

Telegraphic Address:—"GEOL."

MYSORE GEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT,

No. 4070-22 and Enclosure

Bangalore, 7th March 1931.

9

FROM

P. SAMPAT IYENGAR, ESQ., M.A.,
Director of Geology in Mysore,
Bangalore.

B. Narainsamiengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Development Departments,
Bangalore.

With reference to your letter No. D. 8565/Geol. 64-30-2 dated 25-2-'31, forwarding for opinion the petition of Mrs. Khani Begum Saheba, wife of Mr. Hyder Ali Khan, District Superintendent of Police, objecting to the acquisition proceedings sanctioned by Government in April 1930, I have the honour to state as follows:-

1. The land notified for acquisition is wholly included in the area in respect of which Messrs. Oakley Bowden & Co., have been granted a mining lease.

2. The block over which the petitioner was given a prospecting license is different from that over which Messrs. Oakley Bowden & Co., hold the mining lease.

3. The mining lease of the company takes effect from 25th August 1918 and prior to that they held a prospecting license for one year from 25th August 1917. It may safely be stated that since the very begining the attitude of the Inamdars of Dodkattur village has been one of obstruction to mining work in their lands.

4. The claim to mineral rights over the village of Dodkattur put forth in para 1 of the petition is not sustainable, inasmuch as the mineral rights are vested with Government and Dodkattur is not one of the villages to which Governmen have conceded these rights. From the very fact that the petitioner

has secured from Government a prospecting license over Dodkattur lands it is evident that she has acquiesced in the situation.

5. The petitioner was accorded a preferential treatment by Government in that she was granted in May 1925 a prospecting license for Chrome Ore when that was declared a reserved mineral. The license was renewed from year to year with the result that it was current up to 9th May 1929, a period of four long years within which it should have been possible for the petitioner to have obtained the fullest advantage and benefits by carrying on vigorous mining operations. But since nothing of the kind was done a furthe renewal of license or grant of a mining lease was rejected by Government in May 1929; vide your letter No. D. 11598/Geol 96-28-2 dated 8-5-29.

6. From references made in the petition itself it will be clear that the lessees have met with considerable opposition from the Inamdars of the village. Negotiations for amicable settlement for working in the M.L. area having failed, relief had to be sought for under the Land Acquisition Regulation. Accordingly the company was required to deposit Rs 2,000/- towards the cost of the acquisiti When this was also complied with, the Government sanctioned the acqu sition in their order No. D. 11880-83/Geol 44-28-9 dated 22-4-30.

7. The acquisition proceedings have all been completed and the Inamdars are directed to hand over the lands and apply for the compensation award. The objection petition at this stage of the proceedings does not deserve any consideration whatsoever. The circumstances of the case warrant the lessees being put in possession of the acquired lands at as early a date as possible.

8. The enclosures to your letter under reply are returned herewith.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Director,
Mysore Geological Department.

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Genl.

File No. 65-30.

Diary No. of letter replied to 6495

Serial No.

No. Do

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 17. 3. 31

Signed by C. E. Nicholson

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

To

Mir Jahal Hussain, Esq. B.A., B.L., Advocate, Richmond Road, 4th Station, Bangalore.

Dear Sir,

I am desired to inform you that the petition presented by you on behalf of Mrs. Khani Begum Sahiba, wife of the late Hyder Ali Khan, in the matter of the acquisition of certain lands in Dodkatur Inam village, Mysore Taluk, for mining purposes by Messrs. Oakley Bowden & Co., will be heard by the First Member of Council in his Chambers on Monday, the 23rd instant, at 12 noon and to request

over

you must make it convenient to be
present at the time

yours sincerely,

Apptt very to you,

Dear Depth.

G. R. S. VI.—9/g]

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

No. D1687 Gen 65-30-5 DATED *Bangalore,* 19/10/1932

ENDORSEMENT.

Granted to Mehaboobun Khanum Begum Sahiba w/o late Mr. Hyder Ali Khan, District Special Officer Bangalore Road Bangalore

In reply to her petition dated 26/12/30 re the acquisition of certain lands in Wodkolur Inam Village, Mysore for mining purposes by Messrs Oakley Bowden Ltd, the petitioner is informed that Govt see no reason to reconsider the orders already passed. Hence the petition is rejected.

The stay order issued in this office letter no 7357 Gen 65-30-2 d 30/12/30 is cancelled.

By Order

Memo no D1688 19/10/32 d 18/10/32

Secretary to Government

WD 0544—GPB—1,500—18-7-27.

cop letter D.C. Mysore with reference to his correspondence ending with his letter no D 6735 / Gen 65-30-2 d 30/12/30

18/10/32 for Dy Secy

D1687

18th October 1932.

Granted to

Meharbhen Khani Begum Sahiba
wife of Mr.Hyder Ali Khan,
~~the Rosary Rest House Road~~, Bangalore.

In reply to her petition dated 26th December 1930 regarding the acquisition of certain lands in Dodkotur Inam village, Mysore Taluk, for mining purposes by Messrs: Cobly Bowden & Co., the petitioner is informed that Government see no reason to reconsider the orders already passed.

The stay order issued in this office letter No. 6735/Geol.65-30-2 dated 30th December 1930 is cancelled

By Order,

D.Srinivasa Iyengar,
Secretary to Government,
Development Department.

P.T.O.

3T33

Memo No. D1688 9/1/32

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District for information and necessary action in continuation of this office letter No.D.6735/Geol.65-30-2 dated 30th December 1930.

By Order,

Joint Draft

For Secretary to Government,
Development Department.

Sy